

Docket No: HOPPE-10
Appl. No.: 10/789,382

REMARKS

The last Office Action of October 28, 2004 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-9, 17, 18, and 20 have been withdrawn due to an earlier restriction requirement which was made final. Claims 1-9, 17, 18, and 20 have now been canceled. Claim 10 has been amended. New claims 21-23 have been added. Claims 10-16, 19 and 21-23 remain in this application.

Claims 10-15 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US 4,642,493 to Wallace.

Claims 10-16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,258,671 to Vollenwyder et al.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Applicant has been amended claim 10 to include subject matter disclosed in Para. [0023] and [0024] of the specification. Specifically, amended claim 10 now recites that a first molding composition is introduced into the open housing and fills at least a first space between an inner bottom surface of the open housing and a first face of the windings facing the inner bottom surface after insertion of the modular block in the open housing, and that a second molding

Docket No: HOPPE-10
Appl. No.: 10/789,382

composition is applied to a surface of the cover with a thickness so as to fill at least a second space between the surface of the cover and a second face of the windings facing the cover after closing the open housing with the cover. Neither Wallace nor Volenwyder disclose or suggest using two different molding compositions and/or a gas flow path formed between two different molding compositions.

New claims 21-23 include subject matter previously recited in canceled claims 3, 6, and 7.

Withdrawal of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and allowance of claims 10-16 and 19-23 are thus respectfully requested.

CITED REFERENCES

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the newly submitted claims. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Docket No: HOPPE-10
Appl. No.: 10/789,382

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully reminded to initial the form PTO-1449 and to return a copy of the initialed document to the undersigned as an indication that the references, as filed together with the Information Disclosure Statement of February 27, 2004, have been considered and made of record.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: February 15, 2005
350 Fifth Avenue
Suite 4714
New York, N.Y. 10118
(212)244-5500
HMF:WS:ub